

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/899,627	07/05/2001	Jong-won Lee	8021-55 (SS-14743-US)	5141
759	90 06/04/2004		EXAM	INER
Frank Chau			GUERRERO, MARIA F	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLP Suite 501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1900 Hempstead Turnpike			2822	
East Meadow, NY 11554			DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/899,627	LEE ET AL.	
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Maria Guerrero	2822	Au
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	/ to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	-	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content o	divisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing. FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amothe shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
NOTE: the limitations added to the claims would	require further consideration.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>	ind an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: 12-26.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	<u></u>	
		maria Gue	wero

Maria Guerrero Primary Examiner June 2, 2004 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the obviousness-type Double Patenting rejection is over U.S. Patent No. 6,610,596, which has some common inventors with the present application. Aoki (U.S. 6,524,376) is cited as a secondary reference. In addition, the translation of the Korean patent application No.2000-70008 has not been made of record.